

## **REMARKS**

### **A. Introduction**

Claims 6-11, 13-18 and 20-27 were pending and under consideration.

In the Office Action of November 9, 2009 ("the Office Action"), claims 6-11, 13-18 and 20-27 were rejected as obvious.

Without conceding to the merits of the rejections, the claims have been amended to clarify an aspect of the present general inventive concept. Claim 28 is newly added. No new matter has been introduced.

Reconsideration and allowance of all the pending claims are requested.

### **B. Claim Objection**

Claim 16 was objected to for containing a minor informality, which has been remedied in the manner suggested by the Examiner.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection are requested.

### **C. Rejections under 35 USC §112**

1. Claims 8, 15, and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112 as failing to comply with the written description requirement.

To expedite prosecution, these claims have been cancelled thereby rendering the rejection moot.

2. Claims 7-9, 14-16, 21-23 and 27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112 as indefinite.

Without conceding to the merits of the rejection, these claims have been amended to clarify aspects of the present general inventive concept thereby rendering the rejection moot.

Claims 7, 14, and 21 have been amended to clarify that the pixel rows are arranged in an array, as illustrated by Figure 4.

Claims 8, 15, and 22 have been cancelled.

Claims 9, 16, and 23 were only rejected due to their respective dependence from rejected claims 7, 14, and 21, which have been remedied as set forth above.

Claim 27 was rejected for an antecedent basis issue and has been amended to remedy the issue.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are requested.

**D. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103**

Claims 6-8, 11, 13-15, 18, 20-22, 25 and 26 were rejected as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,486,460 to Murakami et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,375,752 to Raynor, et al. and Rhodes, U.S. Patent No. 6,825,878. The rejections are traversed for at least the following reason.

Independent claims 7, 13, 20, and 25 presently recite, *inter alia*, “the plurality of well regions are electrically isolated from each other along each of the plurality of pixel rows.” In the manner, the present general inventive concept advantageously enables pixels along each pixel row to have a more dynamic range with respect to one another.

The Examiner acknowledges that Murakami fails to disclose or suggest well regions that are electrically isolated from each other and relies on Rhodes. See Office Action, page 11. However, Rhodes is limited to separating pixel arrays from logic transistors, which is not the same as a “plurality of well regions are electrically isolated from each other along each of the plurality of pixel rows,” as recited by independent claims 7, 13, 20 and 25. Further, Raynor is silent regarding any well regions. Consequently, the art of record fails to disclose or suggest all of the elements recited by independent claims 7, 13, 20, and 25.

Accordingly, independent claims 7, 13, 20, and 25 are patentable over the art of record. The remaining claims depend from one of independent claims 7, 13, 20, and 25, and therefore include all of the limitations of their respective independent claim. Accordingly, these dependent claims are also patentable over the art of record for the same reasons as their respective independent claims.

**E. New Claim**

New claim 28 has been added. Support for the new claim can be found in the specification and drawings, for example, in Fig 4 and corresponding portions of the Specification. New claim 28 recites features, which are not disclosed or suggested in the prior art of record.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that new claim 28 does not present new matter and is allowable over the prior art of record, and allowance of this claim is earnestly solicited.

**F. Conclusion**

It is respectfully submitted that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, there being no other objections or rejections, this application is in condition for allowance, and a notice to this effect is earnestly solicited.

If any further fees are required in connection with the filing of this amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3140.

Respectfully submitted,  
SONNENSCHN NATH & ROSENTHAL LLP

By /Adam C. Rehm/  
Adam C. Rehm, Reg. No. 54,797  
233 S. Wacker Drive  
Suite 7800  
Chicago, IL 60606-6404  
816-460-2542 (telephone)  
816-531-7545 (facsimile)

ATTORNEYS FOR APPLICANT